



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/824,282

04/14/2004

Mark L. Roth

5681-75900

6128

58467

7590

04/29/2008

MHKKG/SUN

P.O. BOX 398

AUSTIN, TX 78767

EXAMINER

CHAUHAN, LOREN B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2193

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/29/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/824,282	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ROTH, MARK L.	
	<b>Examiner</b> LOREN CHAUHAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to remarks filled on 2/14/2008.
2. Claims 1-2, 4, 15, 18-19, 24-30 and 35-36 have been amended. Claims 1-36 are pending for examination in this application.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 2/14/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In remarks applicant argues:

Lee does not teach a software documentation generator configured to input a plurality of sources, wherein the plurality of sources comprises a plurality of different types of sources and comprises one or more of a software library documentation file and software program source code.

Lee does not teach software documentation generator configured to input plurality of sources related to a software program.

Examiner's response:

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Lee teaches in paragraph [0017] lines 13-15; the documentation tool is a software program that operates on the

plurality of source files further in paragraph [0020] Lee teaches parameters includes types of the source file; Thus teaches plurality of sources comprises different types of sources and comprises one or more of program source code. Although Lee teaches one example wherein the source files are hardware description files, Lee does not limit the source files to such and it is improper under M.P.E.P. 2131.05 for an argument of teaching away based upon one example of such. In fact, Lee is correcting problems associated with documentation tools that are limited to a particular type of source file by creating a diverse tool that handles all types of files.

In remarks applicant argues:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5, 12-20, 23-31 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US PG-PUB. No. 2002/0059348).

6. As per claim 1, Lee teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system, comprising:

a processor (102, fig. 1A); and  
memory coupled to the processor and configured to store program instructions executable by the processor to implement a software documentation generator configured to (paragraph [0016]):

input a plurality of sources (paragraph [0017] lines 13-15) wherein the plurality of sources comprises a plurality of different types of sources (paragraph [0003] lines 5-7) and comprises one or more of a documentation file and software program source code (paragraph [0017]; paragraph [0020]; e.g. a software program that operates on the plurality of source files and parameters define the type of source file);

analyze the one or more sources to identify a type of each of the sources (page 5, [0063] lines 11-12; page [0020]);

extract information from the plurality of sources based on the type of the source (page 5, [0063] lines 13-16; page 2 [0021]);

aggregate the extracted information into a uniform format (page 3 [0033]); and  
transform the aggregated information into one or more specified sets of software documentation (page 4, [0051] lines 1-4).

7. Lee does not explicitly teach plurality of sources related to a software program and comprises a software library documentation file.

8. However, Lee teaches source and specification files are for designing hardware (paragraph [0017]). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention was made to use the invention of Lee to produce the documentation for software products that can generate a documentation file from different types of source files.

9. As per claims 2, 3 and 5, Lee teaches the documentation tool operates on plurality of different types of source files (paragraph [0003] lines 5-7; paragraph [0017] lines 13-15) thus inherently teaches one of the sources comprises the software library documentation file comprises a tag library descriptor and the documentation sets comprise documentation for one or more application programming interfaces (API) provided by a software library.

10. As per claim 4, Lee teaches inputting different types of source files for developing hardware (paragraph [0017]). However, it is known in the art that all the hardware developing is done using software packages and software programs are being developed to emulate the intended hardware functionality thus can be considered as a software program. Therefore Lee teaches one of the sources comprises the software program source code.

11. As per claim 12, Lee teaches the system, wherein the output software documentation sets comprise one or more text files (page 4 [0051] lines 1-4).

12. As per claim 13, Lee teaches the system, wherein the output software documentation sets comprises one or more portable document files (PDF) (page 4 [0051] lines 1-4).

13. As per claim 14, Lee teaches the system, wherein the output software documentation sets comprise one or more hypertext markup language (HTML) files (page 4, [0051] lines 1-4).

14. As per claims 15-19 and 26-30, they are the method and computer accessible medium claims of claims 1-5, therefore; they are rejected for the same reason as per claims 1-5 above.

15. As per claims 20 and 31, Lee teaches the method, wherein said extracting comprises: analyzing a source for type and data format; and selecting a corresponding input source based on said analyzing (paragraph 2 [0021]).

16. As per claims 23-25 and 34-36, they are the method and computer accessible medium claims of claims 12-14, therefore; they are rejected for the same reason as per claims 12-14.

Art Unit: 2193

17. Claim 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US PG-PUB. No. 2002/0059348) in view of Lorenz (US Pat. No 6,405,366).

18. As per claim 6, Lee teaches the system, wherein the software documentation generator is configured to include each input source is configured to extract information from source files of types to which it corresponds (page 2 [0020], [0021]).

19. Lee does not explicitly teach, one or more input source plug-ins, wherein each input source plug-in corresponds to one or more of the source file types.

20. Lorenz teaches one or more source plug-ins, wherein each input source plug-in corresponds to one or more of the source file types (page 8, lines 29-30).

21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the plug ins for different data sources taught by Lorenz in Lee's system so that Lee's system can operate on variety of source files originating from different types of sources.

22. As per claim 7, Lee teaches the method, wherein an input source plug-in is configured to generate information not included in the corresponding source file (page 2 [0020] lines 6-10).



23. As per claim 8, Lee teaches the method, wherein each input source plug-in is configured to output data in the uniform aggregate format (page 3 [0033]).

24. Claim 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US PG-PUB. No. 2002/0059348) in view of Lorenz (US Pat. No 6,405,366) and further in view of Stern (US Pat. No. 6,507,855).

25. As per claim 9, Lee and Lorenzo does not explicitly teach the system, wherein the software documentation generator is configured to include one or more transformer plug-in sets, wherein each transformer plug-in set corresponds to one or more types of output software documentation sets and each transformer plug-in set is configured to generate one or more output software documentation sets of types to which the plug-in corresponds.

26. Stern teaches the system wherein the software documentation generator is configured to include one or more transformer sets, wherein each transformer set corresponds to one or more types of output software documentation sets and each transformer set is configured to generate one or more output software documentation sets of types to which it corresponds (col. 2, lines 58-62; col. 3, lines 48-50).

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include transformer sets taught by Stern in Lee and Lorenzo's system so that programmer can choose any programming environment for generating code and inputting corresponding documentation that sufficiently describe the code (Stern col. 2, lines 43-48).

28. As per claim 10, Stern teaches the method, wherein the input source plug-ins are configured to produce a uniformly formatted aggregate input document and wherein each transformer plug-in set is configured to input data included in the uniformly formatted aggregate input document (col. 3, lines 48-50, 56-61).

29. As per claim 11, Lee teaches the method, wherein a transformer plug-in set is configured to generate information not included in the uniformly formatted aggregate input document (page 3 [0033]).

30. Claim 21-22 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US PG-PUB. No. 2002/0059348) in view of Stern (US Pat. No. 6,507,855).

31. As per claim 21, Lee teaches the method, wherein said aggregating comprises: if a uniformly formatted aggregate input document specifies information not comprised in

data extracted from the source, generating said information (page 2 [0024]); but fails to teach generating a uniformly formatted aggregate input document.

32. Stern teaches generating a uniformly formatted aggregate input document (108 fig. 1).

33. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include uniformly formatted input document as taught by Stern in Lee so that the system can automatically generate documentation directly from the generated code and corresponding documentation input (Stern col. 2, lines 47-48).

34. As per claim 22, Lee teaches the method, wherein said transforming comprises: translating a portion of a uniformly formatted aggregate input document into one or more elements of a software documentation set in the specified output documentation format (page [0035], [0036], [0037]); but does not teach selecting a transformer plug-in set corresponding to a specified output documentation format.

35. Stern teaches selecting a transformer set corresponding to a specified output documentation format (col. 3, lines 56-61).

36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to uniformly formatted input document as taught by Stern in Lee so that the system can automatically generate documentation directly from the generated code and corresponding documentation input (Stern col. 2, lines 47-48).

37. As per claims 32-33, they are the computer accessible medium claims of claims 21-22, therefore; they are rejected for the same reason as per claims 21-22.

### ***Conclusion***

38. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2193

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LOREN CHAUHAN whose telephone number is 571-270-1554. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thr. 9:30-5:00 (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on 571-272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193

Loren Chauhan  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2193

/L. C./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2193